

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 05623 102041Z

17

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-10 ISO-00 AEC-05 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10 IO-03

L-02 NSAE-00 OIC-01 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-14 USIA-04 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-07

DRC-01 /080 W

----- 077445

R 101733Z OCT 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 8128

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T USNATO 5623

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: SPC DISCUSSION OCTOBER 10 ON AIR MANPOWER

REF: STATE 223226

SUMMARY: SPC ON OCTOBER 10 CONSIDERED ROLE OF AIR MANPOWER IN MBFR. UK MAKE STATEMENT REQUESTING THAT SPC SEND ALL FIVE US PROPOSALS TO MBFR WORKING GROUP FOR FURTHER STUDY. NETHERLANDS AND US REPS SAID FURTHER WG STUDY OF INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER IN NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT WAS UNNECESSARY. US REP OUTLINED US VIEWS ON PROBING EAST ON AIR MANPOWER WHILE CONTINUING STUDIES IN NATO, AND SUPPORTED USE OF NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT IN THE PROBE. FRG REP HAD NOT YET RECEIVED INSTRUCTIONS ON US PROPOSALS. SPC RETURNS TO AIR MANPOWER MONDAY, OCTOBER 14. END SUMMARY.

1. UK REP (BAILES) SAID UK AUTHORITIES BELIEVED THE FIVE US PROPOSALS ON AIR MANPOWER HAD IMPORTANT MILITARY SIGNIFICANCE  
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 05623 102041Z

AFFECTING ALL MEMBERS OF THE ALLIANCE. EVEN THE FIFTH US SUGGESTION, WITHDRAWING UP TO 15 PERCENT OF US AND SOVIET AIR MANPOWER IN PHASE I, COULD SERVE AS A PRECEDANT FOR THE OTHER ALLIES IN PHASE II. THE PRESENT WORKING GROUP REPORT DOES

NOT TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION THE US PROPOSALS, AND RECOGNIZES THAT WG CANNOT PURSUE SOME SUBJECTS FURTHER WITHOUT NATIONAL INPUTS. ALLIES HAVE ALREADY STARTED AN EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION ON WHETHER THERE ARE ANY PLANS TO INCREASE AIR MANPOWER WHICH A NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT MIGHT IMPEDE. HOWEVER, THE SPC IS NOT THE IDEAL FORUM FOR SUCH AN EXCHANGE. THE ALLIES NEED THE EXPERTS TO ASK FOR DETAILED JUSTIFICATION OF SUCH NATIONAL INPUTS.

2. BAILES SAID UK THEREFORE PROPOSED SENDING ALL FIVE OF THE US PROPOSALS TO THE MBFR WORKING GROUP FOR MILITARY-TECHNICAL ANALYSIS. THE SPC COULD GIVE THE WG A SIMPLE AND GENERAL MANDATE ALONG THE FOLLOWING LINES:

A) NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT. WORKING GROUP WOULD FINISH COLLECTING NATIONAL STATEMENTS ON PLANS TO INCREASE AIR MANPOWER, AND WOULD STUDY WHETHER NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT SHOULD BE INTRODUCED IN THE PRESENT GUIDANCE ON LINK BETWEEN PHASES (C-M(74)30 (REVISED)), AN IDEA WHICH SEEMS SENSIBLE TO UK.

B) EXCHANGE OF AIR MANPOWER DATA. WORKING GROUP WOULD STUDY WHICH SORTS OF DATA WERE NEEDED.

C) AND D) INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER IN MANPOWER COMMON CEILING AND IN DATA BASED FOR COMPUTING US AND SOVIET PHASE I GROUND FORCE REDUCTIONS. WORKING GROUP WOULD STUDY TECHNICAL IMPLICATIONS INCLUDING WHETHER THESE SUGGESTIONS COULD INVOLVE SIMPLY A FREEZE, AND

E) WITHDRAWING UP TO 15 PERCENT OF US AND SOVIET AIR MANPOWER IN PHASE I. WORKING GROUP WOULD ASSESS EFFECTS ON ALLIES AND ON WARSAW PACT.

BAILES SAID UK WOULD WANT PRELIMINARY DEADLINE FOR WG STUDY OF NOVEMBER 1. IF WG COULD NOT COMPLETE REPORT BY THEN, CHAIRMAN WOULD SUBMIT A REPORT TO SPC. CHAIRMAN WOULD SUBMIT REPORT EARLIER IF WG ABLE TO COMPLETE WORK EARLY ON SOME OF THE US SUGGESTIONS SUCH AS THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT.

3. NETHERLANDS REP (SIZOO) DID NOT AGREE WITH UK VIEWS. HE SAID IT WAS NOT NECESSARY TO SEND ALL OF THE US SUGGESTIONS TO THE WG. THE WG HAD DISCUSSED NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT SUFFICIENTLY. THE  
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 05623 102041Z

NETHERLANDS AUTHORITIES KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT THIS SUBJECT TO CONSIDER IT IN SPC. OTHER SUBJECTS NEED MORE STUDY, ESPECIALLY THE 15 PERCENT US AND SOVIET AIR MANPOWER REDUCTIONS, AND ALSO THOSE ASPECTS OF US SUGGESTIONS C AND D (ABOVE) WHICH MIGHT INVOLVE REDUCTIONS. TURKISH REP (GUR) SUPPORTED THE UK REQUEST TO SEND ALL US PROPOSALS TO THE WG. HE THOUGHT SOME QUESTIONS ON THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT WERE STILL NOT CLEAR, I.E., THE EFFECT ON NUMBERS OF AIRCRAFT AND ON ALLIED FORCES OUTSIDE THE NGA. FRG REP (RANTZAU) SAID BONN HAD NOT YET SENT INSTRUCTIONS ON THE US PROPOSALS. HE ASKED THAT THE SPC DEFER ANY DECISION ON A MANDATE TO THE WG UNTIL THE OCTOBER 14 SPC MEETING.

4. MC REP (GROUP CAPTAIN SMITH) SAID HE SAW A CLEAR DISTINCTION BETWEEN NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT AND REDUCTIONS. HE THOUGHT THE FIRST 3 US SUGGESTIONS CONCERNED NON-INCREASE; THE FOURTH, ON INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER IN THE DATA BASE, SEEMED CAPABLE OF ALLOWING FOR REDUCTIONS.

5. US REP (MOORE) EMPHASIZED THAT US SAW INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER IN THE NEGOTIATIONS AS A MEANS OF ACHIEVING BASIC ALLIED OBJECTIVES. THE US SAW THIS AS A WAY TO BOLSTER EFFORTS TO REACH THE COMMON CEILING, WHILE RETAINING FOCUS ON PACT GROUND SUPERIORITY AND NOT PREJUDICING STEEP ASYMMETRICAL CUTS. HE SAID THE US WANTED TO PROBE THE EAST ON THE AIR MANPOWER ISSUE ALONG THE LINES OF PARAS 3A AND B OF REFTTEL AND THEN IF APPROPRIATE TO PROBE THE POSSIBILITY OF INCLUDING AIR MANPOWER IN THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT. WHILE AHG WAS PROBING OTHER SIDE IN VIENNA, NATO WOULD SIMULTANEOUSLY STUDY THE VARIOUS POSSIBLE WAYS OF INCLUDING AIR MANPOWER IN THE NEGOTIATIONS. DEPENDING ON RESULTS OF THE VIENNA PROBE, ALLIES WOULD BE IN A POSITION TO DECIDE WHAT FURTHER ACTION WAS NECESSARY. THE EAST WOULD NEED TO DEMONSTRATE IN THE PROBE REAL INTEREST WHICH WOULD BE APPLIED TOWARD ACCEPTANCE OF ALLIED NEGOTIATING GOALS.

6. US REP STRESSED THAT INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER IN NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT WAS DISTINCT FROM THE OTHER US PROPOSALS AND SPC COULD CONSIDER IT WITHOUT REFERRAL TO THE WG. HE SAID THE US HAD NO PLANS WHICH WOULD CAUSE US SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS UNDER A NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT. HE DID NOT KNOW WHAT MORE THE US OR OTHER COUNTRIES COULD SAY TO EXPERTS ON THIS  
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 05623 102041Z

SUBJECT. HE THOUGHT EACH ALLY IN STATING ITS VIEW ON NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT IN SPC WOULD WANT TO TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION ITS FUTURE PLANS FOR AIR MANPOWER AND HOW A NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT WOULD AFFECT THESE PLANS. HE NOTED THAT US SUGGESTIONS C AND D EMBRACE A RANGE OF POSSIBILITIES FROM CEILINGS TO REDUCTIONS. THESE WERE SEPARATE SUGGESTIONS FROM SIMPLY INCLUDING AIR MANPOWER IN THE EXISTING NO INCREASE BETWEEN PHASES COMMITMENT.

7. GROUP CAPTAIN SMITH SAID THAT IN HIS VIEW THERE WERE ONLY TWO QUESTIONS WHICH MUST BE ANSWERED FOR SPC TO CONSIDER NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT: 1) WHETHER COUNTRIES HAVE PLANS TO INCREASE AIR MANPOWER WHICH NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT WOULD IMPEDE; AND 2) WHAT PROVISIONS DO ALLIES NEED FOR TEMPORARY INCREASE DUE TO EXERCISES AND TOTATIONS. HE SAID WE NOW HAVE ANSWERS TO THE FIRST QUESTION FROM MOST OF THE COUNTRIES INVOLVED. THE EXISTING NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT IN THE GUIDANCE ON LINK BETWEEN PHASES MAY ANSWER THE SECOND QUESTION.

8. SPC WILL RETURN TO ROLE OF AIR MANPOWER ON MONDAY, OCTOBER 14. MCAULIFFE.

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 11 JUN 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 10 OCT 1974  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** golinofr  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1974ATO05623  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1974/newtext/t19741091/abbryxti.tel  
**Line Count:** 163  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** STATE 223226  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** golinofr  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 20 MAR 2002  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <20 MAR 2002 by martinml>; APPROVED <22 MAY 2002 by golinofr>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: SPC DISCUSSION OCTOBER 10 ON AIR MANPOWER  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA  
BONN  
LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR  
**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005